

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The final Office Action of August 9, 2002, has been received and contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 2-7 and 9-20 are currently pending in this application. Reconsideration and reexamination of this application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has disapproved the drawing filed on May 16, 2002 because the change to Figure 2A allegedly introduces new matter into the specification. Applicant's request to enter the drawing change to Figure 2A is hereby withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 4-7 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Ono et al. (US Patent No. 6,377,323); and rejected claims 3 and 9-20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono et al. (US Patent No. 6,377,323). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 2 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 2 recites a combination of elements including a signal line formed to cross the scanning line, wherein the signal line does not include an extension pattern; a channel layer formed along the signal line and extended to a portion of the scanning line.

None of the cited references teaches or suggests each and every element of the claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner refers to element DL as being the signal line, GL as the scanning line, and AS as the channel layer. In Ono et al., the layer AS may be formed along the signal line, but it is not extended to a portion of the scanning line. As described on at least pages 6 and 7 of the specification, "a portion for the channel layer is extended by ' β ' to increase a width 'w' of the channel layer on the scanning line, which is wider than a variation of

the gate GL is part of the scanning line

the Cgd caused by the misalignment, to assure a more stable operation of the LCD. As shown in FIG. 3, it is possible that the width can be increased by ' β ' instead of ' β ' (dashed portion), or by both the ' β ' and ' β .' Neither Figures 1-3 nor the specification of Ono et al. show or describe such a feature.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is allowable over the cited references and request that the rejection under 35 USC § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Moreover, claims 4-7 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 2, which is believed to be allowable.

not OK
Claim 9 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 9 recites a combination of elements including a channel layer on the gate insulating layer to cross the scanning lines having a portion extended to a top of at least one of the plurality of scanning lines; a signal line formed as a unit with the source electrode along the channel layer which is formed to cross the scanning lines, wherein the signal line does not include an extension pattern.

not OK
Claim 15 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 15 recites a combination of elements including a signal line formed to cross the scanning line to cover a portion of the channel layer, wherein the signal line does not include an extension pattern; a drain electrode formed on the channel layer spaced a distance away from the signal line in parallel to the signal line.

None of the cited references teaches or suggests, singly or in combination, at least these features of the claims.

Similarly in claim 9, as discussed above with reference to claim 2, Ono et al. does not disclose a channel layer on the gate insulating layer to cross the scanning lines having a portion extended to a top of at least one of the plurality of scanning lines.

Ono et al. does not disclose with reference to claim 15, a drain electrode...in parallel to the signal line, because at column 4, lines 26-46, the references states that the “ a portion of the data line constitutes the drain electrode”. Applicant submits that the use of a one piece construction in Ono et al. instead of the structure disclosed in this application is not merely a matter of obvious engineering choice. See *In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965); but see *Schenck v. Nortron Corp.*, 713 F.2d 782, 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983)

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 15 are allowable, as the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and requests that the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Moreover, claims 3, 10-14, and 16-20 are believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on claims 2, 9, and 15, which are believed to be allowable.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner deem that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7371.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office,
then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please credit any overpayment to deposit
Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: November 6, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

By *Teresa M. Arroyo*
Teresa M. Arroyo
Registration No.: 50,015
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 496-7500
Facsimile: (202) 496-7756
Attorneys for Applicant



30827

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE